



DEPARTMENT OF HOMELAND SECURITY

Coast Guard

33 CFR Part 117

[Docket No. USCG-2020-0034]

RIN 1625-AA09

Drawbridge Operation Regulation; Chicago River, Chicago, IL

AGENCY: Coast Guard, DHS.

ACTION: Notice of proposed rulemaking.

---

SUMMARY: The Coast Guard proposes to authorize the Amtrak Railroad Bridge, mile 3.77, across the South Branch of the Chicago River, to be operated remotely and establish an intermediate opening position. The request was made by the bridge owner. This proposed rule will improve vessel flow through the river. This proposed rule will not change the operating schedule of the bridge.

DATES: Comments and relate material must reach the Coast Guard on or before [INSERT DATE 30 DAYS AFTER DATE OF PUBLICATION IN THE FEDERAL REGISTER].

ADDRESSES: You may submit comments identified by docket number USCG-2020-0034 using Federal e-Rulemaking Portal at <https://www.regulations.gov>.

See the “Public Participation and Request for Comments” portion of the SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION section below for instructions on submitting comments.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: If you have questions on this proposed rule, call or e-mail Mr. Lee D. Soule, Bridge Management Specialist, Ninth Coast Guard District; telephone 216-902-6085, e-mail

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:

I. Table of Abbreviations

CFR	Code of Federal Regulations
DHS	Department of Homeland Security
FR	Federal Register
IGLD85	International Great Lakes Datum of 1985
LWD	Low Water Datum based on IGLD85
OMB	Office of Management and Budget
NPRM	Notice of Proposed Rulemaking (Advance, Supplemental)
§	Section
U.S.C.	United States Code

II. Background, Purpose and Legal Basis

The Amtrak Railroad Bridge, mile 3.77, over the South Branch of the Chicago River provides a vertical clearance of 10 feet in the down position and 65 feet in the open position above LWD and a horizontal clearance of 156 feet. The bridge crosses the river on a slight skew on an “S” curve in the river requiring longer vessels to use most of the horizontal clearance for maneuvering. The South Branch of the Chicago River is part of a network of waterways that allow vessels to travel from Chicago, IL to New Orleans, LA. Cook County described the Chicago River as the 5<sup>th</sup> largest port in the United States, hosting commercial vessels over 300 tons, recreational power and sailing vessels, several passenger vessels, water taxis, paddle boats and various paddle craft. Most vessels can pass under all the bridges in the Chicago metropolitan area without an opening, except the Amtrak Bridge. During an average weekday, 150,000 commuters travel over the Amtrak Bridge.

In accordance with general bridge regulations a drawbridge must open promptly and fully when signaled to open. Lifting the bridge to 65 feet for every vessel when most vessels only need an additional 10 feet of clearance increases the delay experienced by all modes of transportation.

The Amtrak Bridge has been operating remotely for several years without any concerns for the mariners.

### III. Discussion of Proposed Rule

We propose to include in the regulations that the AMTRAK Bridge is authorized to operate remotely.

We also propose to allow the bridge to open to an intermediate position that will provide a vertical clearance of 34 feet above LWD. A yellow light at the center of the bridge, visible to vessels approaching the bridge from both upriver and downriver sides will verify the bridge has met the intermediate height. At any time a vessel with greater air draft can radio the drawtender and request a full opening. This proposed rule is expected to increase bridge availability to all users by 50%.

On April 8, 2020, we published a Temporary Deviation in the Federal Register (85 FR 19659) testing the remote operation and the intermediate height and requested comments from the mariners over the summer boating season. No comments were received.

### IV. Regulatory Analyses

We developed this proposed rule after considering numerous statutes and Executive Orders related to rulemaking. Below we summarize our analyses based on these statutes and Executive Orders and we discuss First Amendment rights of protestors.

#### A. Regulatory Planning and Review

Executive Orders 12866 and 13563 direct agencies to assess the costs and benefits of available regulatory alternatives and, if regulation is necessary, to select regulatory approaches that maximize net benefits. This NPRM has not been designated a “significant regulatory action,” under Executive Order 12866.

Accordingly, the NPRM has not been reviewed by the Office of Management and Budget (OMB).

This regulatory action determination is based on the ability that vessels can still transit the bridge without changing the bridge schedule and keeping the maximum advertised clearance available for vessels as needed.

**B. Impact on Small Entities**

The Regulatory Flexibility Act of 1980 (RFA), 5 U.S.C. 601–612, as amended, requires federal agencies to consider the potential impact of regulations on small entities during rulemaking. The term “small entities” comprises small businesses, not-for-profit organizations that are independently owned and operated and are not dominant in their fields, and governmental jurisdictions with populations of less than 50,000. The Coast Guard certifies under 5 U.S.C. 605(b) that this proposed rule would not have a significant economic impact on a substantial number of small entities. While some owners or operators of vessels intending to transit the bridge may be small entities, for the reasons stated in section IV.A above this proposed rule would not have a significant economic impact on any vessel owner or operator by keeping the original schedule and having the maximum lift available on request.

If you think that your business, organization, or governmental jurisdiction qualifies as a small entity and that this rule would have a significant economic impact on it, please submit a comment (see ADDRESSES) explaining why you think it qualifies and how and to what degree this rule would economically affect it.

Under section 213(a) of the Small Business Regulatory Enforcement Fairness Act of 1996 (Public Law 104-121), we want to assist small entities in understanding this proposed rule. If the rule would affect your small business,

organization, or governmental jurisdiction and you have questions concerning its provisions or options for compliance, please contact the person listed in the FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT, above. The Coast Guard will not retaliate against small entities that question or complain about this proposed rule or any policy or action of the Coast Guard.

C. Collection of Information

This proposed rule would call for no new collection of information under the Paperwork Reduction Act of 1995 (44 U.S.C. 3501-3520.).

D. Federalism and Indian Tribal Government

A rule has implications for federalism under Executive Order 13132, Federalism, if it has a substantial direct effect on the States, on the relationship between the national government and the States, or on the distribution of power and responsibilities among the various levels of government. We have analyzed this proposed rule under that Order and have determined that it is consistent with the fundamental federalism principles and preemption requirements described in Executive Order 13132.

Also, this proposed rule does not have tribal implications under Executive Order 13175, Consultation and Coordination with Indian Tribal Governments, because it would not have a substantial direct effect on one or more Indian tribes, on the relationship between the Federal Government and Indian tribes, or on the distribution of power and responsibilities between the Federal Government and Indian tribes. If you believe this proposed rule has implications for federalism or Indian tribes, please contact the person listed in the FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT section above.

#### E. Unfunded Mandates Reform Act

The Unfunded Mandates Reform Act of 1995 (2 U.S.C. 1531-1538) requires Federal agencies to assess the effects of their discretionary regulatory actions. In particular, the Act addresses actions that may result in the expenditure by a State, local, or tribal government, in the aggregate, or by the private sector of \$100,000,000 (adjusted for inflation) or more in any one year. Though this proposed rule will not result in such an expenditure, we do discuss the effects of this proposed rule elsewhere in this preamble.

#### F. Environment

We have analyzed this rule under Department of Homeland Security Management Directive 023-01, U.S. Coast Guard Environmental Planning Policy COMDTINST 5090.1 (series) and U.S. Coast Guard Environmental Planning Implementation Procedures (series) which guide the Coast Guard in complying with the National Environmental Policy Act of 1969 (NEPA)(42 U.S.C. 4321-4370f). We have made a preliminary determination that this action is one of a category of actions that do not individually or cumulatively have a significant effect on the human environment. This proposed rule promulgates the operating regulations or procedures for drawbridges. Normally this action is categorically excluded from further review, under paragraph L49, of Chapter 3, Table3-1 of the U.S. Coast Guard Environmental Planning Implementation Procedures.

Neither a Record of Environmental Consideration nor a Memorandum for the Record are required for this rule.

#### G. Protest Activities

The Coast Guard respects the First Amendment rights of protesters. Protesters are asked to contact the person listed in the FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT section to coordinate protest activities so that your

message can be received without jeopardizing the safety or security of people, places or vessels.

#### V. Public Participation and Request for Comments

We view public participation as essential to effective rulemaking, and will consider all comments and material received during the comment period. Your comment can help shape the outcome of this rulemaking. If you submit a comment, please include the docket number for this rulemaking, indicate the specific section of this document to which each comment applies, and provide a reason for each suggestion or recommendation.

We encourage you to submit comments through the Federal eRulemaking Portal at <https://www.regulations.gov>. If your material cannot be submitted using <https://www.regulations.gov>, contact the person in the FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT section of this document for alternate instructions.

We accept anonymous comments. All comments received will be posted without change to <https://www.regulations.gov> and will include any personal information you have provided. For more about privacy and the docket, visit <https://www.regulations.gov/privacynotice>.

Documents mentioned in this NPRM as being available in this docket and all public comments, will be in our online docket at <https://www.regulations.gov> and can be viewed by following that website's instructions. Additionally, if you go to the online docket and sign up for email alerts, you will be notified when comments are posted or a final rule is published.

#### List of Subjects in 33 CFR Part 117

Bridges.

For the reasons discussed in the preamble, the Coast Guard proposes to amend 33 CFR part 117 as follows:

PART 117—DRAWBRIDGE OPERATION REGULATIONS

1. The authority citation for part 117 continues to read as follows:

Authority: 33 U.S.C. 499; 33 CFR 1.05-1; DHS Delegation No. 0170.1.

2. Revise § 117.391 by adding paragraph (d) to read as follows:

**§ 117.391 Chicago River.**

\* \* \* \* \*

(d) The Amtrak Bridge, mile 3.77, is authorized to operate remotely and open to the intermediate position on signal, unless a request for a full opening is received by the drawtender. The bridge is required to operate a marine radio.

Dated: April 5, 2021.

D. L. COTTRELL

Rear Admiral, U.S. Coast Guard

Commander, Ninth Coast Guard District

[FR Doc. 2021-09002 Filed: 5/3/2021 8:45 am; Publication Date: 5/4/2021]